REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are pending. Claims 1-33 are rejected. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the instant response. Claims 1, 12, and 23 are amended herein. The specification has been amended herein. No new matter has been added herein as a result of the amendments.

Specification

Title of the Invention

In the Office Action mailed on April 7, 2008 (hereinafter, "instant Office Action"), the Examiner objected to the title, "Methods and Systems for Dynamically Configuring a Network Component", as not being descriptive of the invention. Applicants have amended the title as follows, "Methods and Systems for Dynamically Configuring a Network Component to Reroute Media Streams". Support for this amendment appears at least on page 10, third paragraph of Applicants' specification. Applicants respectfully assert that the amended title is descriptive of the invention, and appears to the Applicants to be within the standards provided by the MPEP. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the title be withdrawn.

Abstract

The Abstract has been amended to coincide with the amended title to the invention.

Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1 has been amended to reflect the following (Claims 12 and 23 included similar amended features):

A method for dynamically configuring a network component <u>to reroute media streams</u>, comprising:

receiving a request for content from a first network connected component;

determining a type of media service needed for at least a portion of said content <u>to fulfill said request</u>; and

configuring a data relaying component to forward said at least a portion of said content from a second network connected component to a third network connected component<u>, wherein said portion of said content is positioned to receive said type of media service performed by said third network connected component</u>.

Support for the amendment, "to reroute media streams", can be found at least on page 11, third paragraph. Support for the amendment, "to fulfill said request", can be found at least on page 11, third paragraph. Support for the amendment, "wherein said portion of said content is positioned to receive said type of media service performed by said third network connected component", can be found at least on page 10, first paragraph.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection

The instant Office Action states that Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by McCanne (U.S. Patent No. 6,785,704) (hereinafter, "McCanne"). The Applicants have reviewed McCanne and respectfully submit that the embodiments recited in Claims 1-33 are not anticipated by McCanne. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rationale.

Claims 1, 12, and 23

The instant Office Action states that Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by McCanne (U.S. Patent No. 6,785,704) (hereinafter, McCanne). The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 1-33 is not anticipated by McCanne. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rationale.

Applicants respectfully point out that amended independent Claim 1, and the similar embodiments of Claims 12 and 23, recites:

> A method for dynamically configuring a network component to reroute media streams, comprising:
>> receiving a request for content from a first network connected component;
>> determining a type of media service needed for at least a portion of said content to fulfill said request; and

configuring a data relaying component to forward said at least a portion of said content from a second network connected component to a third network connected component, wherein said portion of said content is positioned to receive said type of media service performed by said third network connected component.

(Emphasis added.)

MPEP §2131 provides:

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference". MPEP §2131; *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 103 (Fed. Cir. 1987). ... "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). "The elements must be arranged as required by the claim..." *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The instant Office Action states the following:

McCanne discloses at least a method for dynamically configuring a network component, comprising:... determining a type of media service needed for at least a portion of said content; and configuring a data relaying component ... to forward said at least a portion of said content from a second network connected component to a third network connected component to receive said type of media service.

(Emphasis added; Instant Office Action, page 4, second paragraph through fourth paragraph.)

Applicants respectfully submit that McCanne does not anticipate "determining a type of media service needed for at least a portion of said content to fulfill said request" or "configuring a data relaying component to forward said at least a portion of said content from a second network connected component to a third network connected component, wherein said portion of

said content is positioned to receive said type of media service performed by said third network

connected component" (emphasis added) as is recited in Applicants' Claim 1. Applicants

understand McCanne to disclose a framework in which "content is 'routed' to the clients as

content" (McCanne, col. 12, lines 40-42), whereby:

> …content can be efficiently carried across the network to servers near the end user which
> both enhances the quality of the user's experience (because content is delivered quickly
> with less loss) and the network efficiency (because content is efficiently replicated
> through-out the network infrastructure reducing the number of copies that are transmitted
> across congested network peering points and backbone networks).

(Emphasis added; McCanne, col. 12, lines 53-67 through col. 13, lines 1-3.)

McCanne focuses on reducing the congestion network by providing a server array 54

over a distribution network 52 (McCanne, col. 12, lines 40-47). Additionally, McCanne

discloses a redirection fabric "to provide the best possible content distribution path" (McCanne,

col. 13, lines 7-8) for efficiently "attach[ing] a client to the most appropriate server" (McCanne,

col. 13, lines 5-6).

In contrast, Applicants' the claimed embodiments are directed toward "determining a

type of media service needed for at least a portion of said content to fulfill sai drequest" or

"configuring a data relaying component to forward said at least a portion of said content from a

second network connected component to a third network connected component, wherein said

portion of said content is positioned to receive said type of media service performed by said third

network connected component" (emphasis added) as is recited in Applicants' Claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that McCanne remains silent as to determining when portions of

requested content require media services to be applied in order to fulfill the content request, and the delivery of the portion of the content to a third network connected component for receipt by the content of such media services at the third network connected component.

Furthermore, the instant Office Action indicates that its' distribution network 52 is equivalent to Applicants' third network connected component of Claim 1 (McCanne, page 4, fifth paragraph). However, McCanne's distribution network 52 does not perform media services, and does not perform media services on at least a portion of requested content. Thus, McCanne's distribution network 52 does not equate to Applicants' third network connected component.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that McCanne does not anticipate "determining a type of media service needed for at least a portion of said content to fulfill said request" or "configuring a data relaying component to forward said at least a portion of said content from a second network connected component to a third network connected component, wherein said portion of said content is positioned to receive said type of media service performed by said third network connected component" (emphasis added) as is recited in Applicants' Claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that McCanne does not anticipate the features as are set forth in independent Claim 1, and as such, Claim 1 traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and is condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants also respectfully submit that McCanne does not anticipate Claims 12 and 23 for reasons stated herein regarding Claim 1. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-11 dependent on Claim 1, Claims 13-

22 dependent on Claim 12, and Claims 24-33 dependent on Claim 23 overcome the rejection

under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being dependent on an allowable base Claim and are also in

condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above-listed remarks and amendments, the Applicants respectfully request allowance of the Claims 1-33.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNERBLECHER, LLP

Date: 06/30/2008   /John P. Wagner, Jr./

John P. Wagner, Jr.
Registration No. 35,398

Wagner Blecher LLP

123 Westridge Drive
Watsonville, CA 95076
(408) 377-0500